

Core Protections Compliance Summary Totals*

(as of September 30, 2000)

	Number of Jurisdictions
institutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO)	
Full compliance—zero violations	9
Full compliance—de minimis exceptions	39
Not in compliance—ae minimus exceptions	4
Funds withheld pending additional compliance data	2
Not participating	2
paration of Juvenile and Adult Offenders	
Full compliance—zero violations	41
Full compliance—exception provision	11
Funds withheld pending additional compliance data	2
Not participating	2
and Lockup Removal	
Full compliance—zero violations	11
Full compliance— <i>de minimis</i> exceptions	38
Not in compliance	3
Funds withheld pending additional compliance data	2
Not participating	2
sproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC)	
Completed identification and assessment, implementing intervention and monitoring	21
Completed identification and assessment, implementing intervention	15
Completed identification and assessment/updating data and revising intervention plan	2
Completed identification/implementing intervention/ conducting formal assessment	3
Conducting identification phase	1
Exempt from DMC requirement	1 7
EXEMPLITORI DAVIC TEQUITERIERI	, 5
DMC status under review	

28 FY 2000

comprehensive plans for compliance with the DMC core protection.



State Compliance Based on 1998 Reports: Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO), Sec. 223(a)(12)(A)

Formula Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2000)	Full compliance	Full compliance	Not in compliance	Funds withheld pending	Formula Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2000)	Full compliance	Full compliance	Not in compliance	Funds withheld pending	- Simpliance des
Alabama		*			New Hampshire		*			
Alaska		*			New Jersey				*	1
Arizona		*			New Mexico		*			1
Arkansas		*			New York	*				1
California		*			North Carolina		*			1
Colorado		*			North Dakota		*			1
Connecticut		*			Ohio				*	1
Delaware		*			Oklahoma		*			1
Dist. of Columbia		*			Oregon		*			1
Florida		*			Pennsylvania		*			1
Georgia		*			Rhode Island		*			1
Hawaii		*			South Carolina			*		1
Idaho		*			South Dakota ^b					
Illinois		*			Tennessee			*		
Indiana		*			Texas		*			1
Iowa		*			Utah		*			1
Kansas		*			Vermont	*				1
Kentucky		*			Virginia		*			1
Louisiana		*			Washington			*		
Maine	*				West Virginia		*			
Maryland		*			Wisconsin		*			
Massachusetts		*			Wyoming ^b					
Michigan		*			Amer. Samoa	*				
Minnesota		*			Guam	*				
Mississippi			*		N. Mariana Is.	*				
Missouri		*			Puerto Rico	*				
Montana	*				Virgin Is.	*				
Nebraska		*			TOTALS	9	39	4	2	
Nevada		*								-

 $^{^{\}rm a}\text{Fewer than }29.4$ violations per 100,000 persons under age 18 in the State.

FY 2000 29

^bSouth Dakota and Wyoming did not participate in the FY 2000 Formula Grants program.



State Compliance Based on 1998 Reports: Separation of Juvenile and Adult Offenders, Sec. 223(a)(13)

Formula Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2000)	Full compliance	Full compliance	Funds withheld pending	Formula Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2000)	Full compliance	Full compliance—	Funds withheld pending	- inpliance of
Alabama	*			New Hampshire	*			
Alaska		•		New Jersey			*	
Arizona	*			New Mexico	+			
Arkansas	*			New York		*		
California	*			North Carolina	*			
Colorado	*			North Dakota	*			
Connecticut	*			Ohio			*	
Delaware	*			Oklahoma	*			
Dist. of Columbia	*			Oregon	*			
Florida	*			Pennsylvania	*			
Georgia		*		Rhode Island	*			ĺ
Hawaii		*		South Carolina	*			
Idaho		*		South Dakota ^b				
Illinois	*			Tennessee		*		
Indiana	*			Texas		*		
Iowa		*		Utah	*			
Kansas	*			Vermont	*			
Kentucky	*			Virginia	*			
Louisiana		*		Washington	*			
Maine	*			West Virginia		*		
Maryland	*			Wisconsin	*			
Massachusetts	*			Wyoming ^b				
Michigan	*			Amer. Samoa	*			
Minnesota	*			Guam	*			
Mississippi		*		N. Mariana Is.	*			
Missouri	*			Puerto Rico	+			
Montana	*			Virgin Is.	*			
Nebraska	*			TOTALS	41	11	2	
Nevada	*							

^aOJJDP regulatory criteria set forth in Section 31.303(f)(6)(ii) of the OJJDP Formula Grants Regulation (28 C.F.R. 31) and published in the May 31, 1995, *Federal Register*, allow States reporting noncompliant incidents to continue in the program provided the incidents are not in violation of State law and no pattern or practice exists.

30 FY 2000

^bSouth Dakota and Wyoming did not participate in the FY 2000 Formula Grants program.



State Compliance Based on 1998 Reports: Jail and Lockup Removal, Sec. 223(a)(14)

Formula Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2000)	Full compliance_	Full compliance	Not in compliance	Funds withheld pending	Formula Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2000)	Full compliance	Full compliance—	Not in compliance	Funds withheld pending
Alabama	*				New Hampshire		*		
Alaska			*		New Jersey				*
Arizona		*			New Mexico		*		
Arkansas		*			New York		*		
California		*			North Carolina	*			
Colorado		*			North Dakota		*		
Connecticut		*			Ohio				*
Delaware		*			Oklahoma		*		
Dist. of Columbia	*				Oregon	*			
Florida		*			Pennsylvania		*		
Georgia		*			Rhode Island		*		
Hawaii		*			South Carolina	*			
Idaho		*			South Dakota ^b				
Illinois			*		Tennessee		*		
Indiana		*			Texas		*		
Iowa		*			Utah		*		
Kansas		*			Vermont	*			
Kentucky		*			Virginia		*		
Louisiana		*			Washington		*		
Maine			*		West Virginia		*		
Maryland		*			Wisconsin		*		
Massachusetts		*			Wyoming ^b				
Michigan		*			Amer. Samoa	*			
Minnesota		*			Guam	*			
Mississippi		*			N. Mariana Is.	*			
Missouri		*			Puerto Rico	*			
Montana		*			Virgin Is.	*			
Nebraska		*			TOTALS	11	38	3	2
Nevada		*							

^aState was found in compliance based on the numerical or substantive *de minimis* standard criteria set forth in Section 31.303(f)(6)(iii)(B) of the OJJDP Formula Grants Regulation (28 C.F.R. 31) and published in the May 31, 1995, *Federal Register*.

FY 2000 31

^bSouth Dakota and Wyoming did not participate in the FY 2000 Formula Grants program.



State Compliance Based on FY 2000 Formula Grants Program Comprehensive Plan: Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC), Sec. 223(a)(23)

Formula Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2000)	Completed identification and assessment/in	Completed identification	Completed identification and revising:	S Mervention data and Completed identification/ conducts this into-	Conducting ideases	Exempt from Day	DMC status und	Formula Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2000)	Completed identification internal	Completed identification	Completed identification and revising in. Value in Value	Completed identification/	Conducting identification	Exempt from p	DMC status und.
Alabama				*				New Hampshire					*		
Alaska		*						New Jersey							*
Arizona		*						New Mexico		*					
Arkansas	*							New York		*					
California			*					North Carolina	*						
Colorado	*							North Dakota	*						
Connecticut	*							Ohio							*
Delaware			*					Oklahoma	+						
Dist. of Columbia							*	Oregon							*
Florida	*							Pennsylvania	+						
Georgia	*							Rhode Island		*					
Hawaii		*						South Carolina	*						
Idaho	*							South Dakota ^c							
Illinois		•						Tennessee	*						
Indianaª	*							Texas		*					
Iowa	*							Utah	*						
Kansas		*						Vermont ^b						*	
Kentucky							*	Virginia	*						
Louisiana	*							Washington	*						
Maine ^b						*		West Virginia	*						
Maryland		*						Wisconsin		*					
Massachusetts		*						Wyoming ^c							
Michigan		*						Amer. Samoa ^d						*	
Minnesota		*						Guam ^d						*	
Mississippi				*				N. Mariana Is. ^d						*	
Missouri	*							Puerto Rico ^e						*	
Montana				*				Virgin Is.d						*	
Nebraska		*						TOTALS	21	15	2	3	1	7	5
Nevada	*														

^aIndiana has plans to update DMC identification and assessment data.

32 FY 2000

^bMaine and Vermont are exempt from the DMC requirement because their minority juvenile population does not exceed 1 percent of the total State juvenile population.

 $^{^{\}rm c}$ South Dakota and Wyoming did not participate in the FY 2000 Formula Grants program.

 $^{^{\}mathrm{d}}$ In four territories, it has been determined that minority juveniles are not disproportionately arrested or detained.

 $^{^{\}rm e} Puer to \ Rico \ is \ exempt \ from \ reporting \ racial \ statistics \ because \ of \ the \ homogeneity \ of \ its \ population.$